





A CATECHISM

ON

THE DOCTRINES

OF THE

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

BY THE REV. PROF. CROSKERY, M.A.,

Magee College, Londonderry.

“Beware of Antinomianism—resting on the doctrines of grace without watchfulness of the walk before God. All that religion is fallacy.”

—REV. J. HARRINGTON EVANS.

“By this Church-tearing vice the Christian world has been ground to powder.”—RICHARD BAXTER.

“A tender conscience would not espouse opinions under one, two, or many years’ deliberation (even supposing them to be true), which an Antinomian or other sectary will take up in a few days.”—RICHARD BAXTER.

“Have you tried these Brethren—the Darbyites? I have tried them (try the spirits whether they are of God) and found them false prophets—in every sense of the word, false! They are false in what they say of their brethren, they are false in doctrine, and they are false in their walk.”—LORD CONGLETON (A PLYMOUTH BROTHER, BUT NOT A DARBYITE)

TORONTO:

“CANADA PRESBYTERIAN” OFFICE, 5 JORDAN STREET,

1879.





20
MOLL
TU
876R

A CATECHISM

ON

THE DOCTRINES

OF THE

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

BY THE REV. THOS. CROSKERY, M.A.,

Magee College, Belfast.

“Beware of Antinomianism—resting on the doctrines of grace without watchfulness of the walk before God. All that religion is fallacy.”
—REV. J. HARRINGTON EVANS.

“By this Church-tearing vice the Christian world has been ground to powder.”—RICHARD BAXTER.

“A tender conscience would not espouse opinions under one, two, or many years’ deliberation (even supposing them to be true), which an Antinomian or other sectary will take up in a few days.”—RICHARD BAXTER.

“Have you tried these Brethren—the Darbyites? I have tried them (try the spirits whether they are of God) and found them false prophets—in every sense of the word, false! They are false in what they say of their brethren, they are false in doctrine, and they are false in their walk.”—LORD CONGLETON (A PLYMOUTH BROTHER, BUT NOT A DARBYITE)

TORONTO:

“CANADA PRESBYTERIAN” OFFICE, 5 JORDAN STREET,

1879.

BX 8800

C7

1879

PREFACE.

Frequently I have been asked the question, How far the Lay Preachers are tinged with Plymouth doctrines; and my answer has always been—"In four cases out of five." Notwithstanding their repudiation of the name, their doctrinal opinions and their attitude toward the Churches are unmistakably Plymouthist, and the effect of their teaching has usually been to withdraw their converts from all existing denominations into small drawing-room coteries, which gradually ripen into Plymouth societies. They usually affirm, on their first appearance in a district, that they are not Plymouth, and the only method of ascertaining their real position is to ask, Do they hold such and such doctrines? or, Do they break bread in any of the evangelical Churches? Christian people are often deceived by their apparent catholicity, for "they abhor sectarianism in every form," and simply mean to "preach the gospel." Three years ago I said of the Brethren—and the remark applies equally to the Lay-Preachers—"We have been assured that it is their usual habit, on their first advances, to assume the airs of the most Catholic and pacific of Christians, concealing their peculiarities, and even claiming a superiority above others in undervaluing all sectional differences; but that, having succeeded in making a few proselytes, the mask is thrown off, and they commence, cautiously at first, and adapting themselves to the capacity of their neophytes, to initiate them in the esoteric doctrines of their sect. Their practice is to gather churches out of churches, leaving to others the rough work of filling up the side-pews and galleries out of the lanes and alleys, and confining themselves to the daintier work of making proselytes of those who have been so painfully gathered into the fold."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, July, 1865.

It is certainly a new style of Christianity that prompts its disciples to conceal their opinions, and admits of all kinds of dexterous evasions to accomplish their divisive and sectarian objects. It is a style that is neither Christ-like nor apostolic; for our Divine Master "spake openly to the world—in secret did he say nothing." But the Brethren are perfectly silent on Ministry, Baptism, the Law, and the Sabbath in their public meetings. They reserve these questions for their drawing-room conversations, to which the converts are affectionately invited, and the result is, in many cases, that the latter are re-baptized—usually at some distance from the scene of operations—and a table is set up where the disciples "break bread" every Lord's Day. The converts are thus finally withdrawn from their several Churches by men who came to the district disclaiming all intention of "founding a sect."

I earnestly pray that my humble production may be widely successful, through the blessing of the Divine Spirit, in stemming the tide of Antinomian error and advancing the cause of Bible truth.

T. C.

LONDONDERRY, May 1, 1868.

CATECHISM

Q. Who are the Plymouth Brethren?

A. A modern sect of Christians, variously known as Plymouth Brethren, Brethren, or Darbyites. They arose about forty years ago in Plymouth.

Q. What are their views?

A. They hold peculiar views upon Faith, Repentance, Justification, Sanctification, the Sabbath, the Church, the Ministry, the Moral Law, Prayer, and the Holy Spirit. They are also Anabaptists and Millenarians.

THE MORAL LAW.

Q. What are their views concerning the Moral Law?

A. That the Moral Law is not a rule of life to believers under the Christian dispensation (many hold that it is still binding on unbelievers); that the believer is not bound to obey it, for he is now under the new and higher law of love, as "love is the fulfilling of the law."

Q. What answer do you make to these assertions?

A. 1. Love was always the fulfilling of the law, even in Old Testament times; for was not the sum of the Ten Commandments love? (Mat. xxii. 40). 2. Love is not a new commandment at all. (1 John ii. 7.) 3. In Romans xiii. 8, 9, quoted by the Brethren, believers are exhorted to love one another *on the ground of its being a requirement of the Moral Law*. 4. The words—"Love is the fulfilling of the law" do not prove the law obsolete: they mean—Love is the *principle* or spring of our obedience. It enables us to obey the law. The mode of its manifestation is the subject of positive prescription. Love cannot be the *rule* of obedience—it *can* be the spring or motive of it. This is to confound the railway track with the steam power which drives the train. Love is the steam-power and not the track. The Moral Law is the track and not the steam-power. Love does not tell me *what* to do: it tells me *how* to do it. Love

is a motive, not a rule. Love goes to the law to learn the Divine will. The law of love, therefore, *includes* the Moral Law. (Romans xiii. 8, 9.)

Q. But are we not under the law of liberty, which is not surely the law of Moses—"So speak ye and so do, as they that will be judged by the law of liberty?" (James ii. 12.)

A. This law, too, includes the law of Moses, for James says—"If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scriptures, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' ye do well." Now this law is not obsolete, for we are commanded to obey it; yet it is part of the law of Moses. (Lev. xix. 18.) Again "He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Now, no man can be a transgressor of an obsolete law. This, too, was said to *believers*. James quotes two passages from the law of Moses—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and "Thou shalt not have respect of persons." To illustrate the law of liberty. Therefore, the royal law and the law of liberty are one and the same law, or, rather, the royal law remains in the Gospel.

Q. But Paul says: "Ye are not under law, but under grace?" (Rom. vi. 14.)

A. This has nothing to say to the law *as a rule of life*. Else why should Roman Christians (Rom. xiii. 8, 9.) and Ephesian Christians (Eph. vi. 1-3) and Christians in general (James ii.) be referred to the law itself as a rule of life and conduct? Law and grace are antithetical in the passage. If the law here means merely a rule, then grace is a rule too; and Paul must mean in that case—"Ye are not under law as a rule, but under grace as a rule." "But grace can be no *rule*—it is a force, a power. Besides, it makes Paul argue lamely—"Sin shall have no dominion over you; for grace is your rule. The passage means: "Ye are not under the law as a condition of salvation, but under a system of free justification; or, "Ye are not under the law stirring up sin, but under grace sanctifying and healing.

Q. But Paul says you cannot have two husbands at the same time (Rom. vii. 1-5), and Christ being now your husband you are dead to the law?

A. 1. Paul cannot regard the law as altogether obsolete, for he says (v. 25.)—"With the mind I myself serve the law of God." He cannot contradict himself. 2. He holds that the believer is dead to the law as a way of life. He does not say the law itself is dead: *it* is unchanged; but our relation to it is altered. 3. He is not here speaking of the law as a *rule*, but of life itself—which we have by Christ and not by the law, and which leads to good works. (v. 4.) 4. If we are under Christ, we are under the law as a rule, for the law of Christ includes the Moral Law. (Matt. v. 17.) We are liberated from the law that we may be able to keep the law. We get the "no condemnation" in order that "the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us." (Rom. viii. 4.) 5. This very chapter (vii.) is intended to show the use and effect of the law in the case of converted men.

Q. But Paul never makes the distinction of modern divines between the law as a way of justification and as a rule of life. The law can do nothing but curse. If, then, a believer is put under it, he is put under the curse.

A. The law can do something else than curse. Paul could serve it—(Rom. vii. 25)—and delight in it. (v. 22.) What rule had David and the Old Testament saints? The law. (Psalm cxix.) Therefore the law can do something else than curse. It can be a guide as well as a condemner. The Lord said in Old Testament times—(Jer. xxxi. 31.)—"I will put my *laws* into their mind," referring to Christian times. (Heb. viii. 10) Were these laws to curse? Christ has "redeemed us from the curse of the law," but not from the law itself as a guide.

Q. But Paul says: "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient? (1 Tim. i. 9.)

A. This proves (1) that Christ did not absolutely abrogate the Decalogue, for it remains to condemn the lawless: "it is good if a man use it lawfully." (v. 8.) 2. This proves that it is to be *used*. 3. Paul is speaking here of the relation the law bears to the lawless; and what is that? *a state of condemnation*. In that sense it was *not* made for the righteous. 4. Paul is here incensed at Jewish teachers for making the law necessary to salvation. Therefore, he is not speaking of the law here as a mere rule of life.

Q. But the law was made for the Jews, and not for us Gentiles?

A. How is it, then, that Paul enforces the duties of the Decalogue on Gentiles? (Rom. xiii. 8, 9.) Is it not the fact that Paul regards Jew and Gentile as one people? (1 Cor. x.) The Gentiles are said to be Abraham's seed. (Gal. iii. 29.)

Q. But the Ten Commandments are an imperfect rule of disobedience: they are negative, and Gospel duties have no place in them?

A. Our Lord recognized their perfection in His answer to the question of the lawyer, "Which is the great commandment of the law?" He expounded them in his Sermon on the Mount, and freed them from the false glosses of the Scribes.—2. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not enjoined in them *formally*; neither are they enjoined in the commandment of Christ—"Love one another." But the question is, whether the Decalogue, as interpreted by Christ, does not require the observance of *all* Gospel duties. All such have their origin in love, and this is the sum of the Decalogue. 3. Even if it were imperfect, it does not follow that it is not binding as far as it goes. 4. Christ never enjoined a greater love than the law. He did not originate one iota of his law: He borrowed it professedly from the Old Testament. Besides, it was the only revealed and written law he had himself. (Psalm xl. 8.) Our new relationship to the law is that of Christ himself to it, and our feelings to it ought to be the same: "Thy law is within my heart." Surely the believer is not greater than his Lord.

Q. But it could never teach me to love my enemies?

A. It does not say that it is right to kill your enemy any more than your friend. "Love your enemies" is no new commandment. Christ liberates the word "neighbour" from its narrow Jewish sense in Matthew, v. 43. It includes enemies as well as friends.

Q. But I imitate Christ, not the law?

A. But Christ's life was one great law-fulfilling; and he said—"Thy law is within my heart." (Psalm xl. 8.) Christ is a living model, but that does not supersede the law. If Christ be the end of the law, how is he contrary to it? If

Christ and the law could dwell together under the Old Testament, why not under the New?

Q. But the law cannot work grace?

A. Neither can the Gospel itself. It is unfair to take the law *without* the Spirit, and the Gospel *with* the Spirit, and then contrast them.

Q. But the law was written on tables of stone; the Gospel on fleshly tables of the heart?

A. No. To make the analogy fair, the Gospel is written on paper. Surely when David delighted in the law, it was written on the fleshly tables of his heart. (See Prov. iii. 3; Jer. xvii. 1.)

Q. But "the law and the prophets were until John?" (Luke xvi. 16.) The law was to end when John came.

A. 1. But according to your principles, it could not end for three years after—viz., till the death of Christ. 2. See Mathew xi. 13, where the meaning is clearer—"For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John;" showing it to be the typical part of the law. 3. The law means the dispensation of Moses, as Paul often takes it. (Heb.)

Q. But the law is the ministration of death? (2 Cor. iii. 7.)

A. 1. You are here to take the law nakedly *without* the Spirit, and the Gospel *with* the Spirit; for the Gospel without the Spirit would be a ministration of death, too—"the savour of death." 2. He is not speaking here of the moral law specifically, but of the whole dispensation of the Jews.

Q. What positive evidence can you give me that the Moral Law is still binding on believers as a rule of life?

A. Christ says "He came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it." (Mat. v. 17.) He refers here to the *Moral* precepts of the law, for he speaks of "good works" in v. 16, and illustrates the Commandments in subsequent verses. He foresees the Antinomianism of future times in v. 19; and speaks in v. 20 of a righteousness which *includes* the Ten Commandments, for he would not have told them in the same breath to keep them, and then commanded a higher law which *excluded* them. It is strange that his first and longest sermon was to vindicate the law.

Q. But the Kingdom of Heaven was not yet set up, and this sermon does not apply to the Gospel Dispensation?

A. Christ speaks here of the Gospel Dispensation, for he says—"He shall be least IN the kingdom of heaven." (v. 19.) Surely the closing words of the sermon—"Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect,"—are applicable to the highest spirituality of the gospel state.

Q. But Christ fulfilled the law, and our legal oneness with him exempts us from all further obedience to it?

A. If so, then we are exempted from all obedience whatsoever to the commands of Christ himself, and of Paul, as well as to those of the Decalogue. But Christ's obedience to law does not exempt us from personal obedience to it, any more than his sufferings and death exempt us from a personal death, or suffering for his sake. We do not suffer and die as he did to satisfy divine justice, so neither do we yield obedience to the law in order to obtain eternal life by it.

Q. What other passage do you refer to?

A. Paul says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." (Rom. iii. 31.) We set it on a firmer basis than ever. It is now *for* us, not *against* us. This is the Moral Law, as the Brethren admit. Now, if the law ceases to be binding as a rule on believers, then Christ did come to destroy its authority over them, and faith does make it void.

Q. But Christ established the law by fulfilling it, and through our legal oneness with him we are no longer called to fulfil it?

A. 1. You are not called to fulfil it for your justification; but Paul says, notwithstanding, that he served this very law of God after his conversion. (Romans vii. 25.) 2. Christ's obedience to law for you does not stand as an equivalent to the sum of your whole Christian obedience after conversion. (See the answer before the last.) 3. You still argue on the false supposition that the law can do nothing but curse.

Q. What other evidence is there on the point?

A. Paul says:—"Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ"—(1 Cor. ix. 21)—implying that there is no alternative between being under the law to Christ and being without law altogether. It was not an altered law, but the same law put upon a new footing.

Q. But "under the law to Christ" ought to be translated "duly subject to Christ?"

A. It ought not. The word *ennomos* means within the boundaries of the law, as where it is said, "If it be determined in a *lawful* assembly"—that is, convened according to law. (Acts xiii. 39.) If the Greek word *anomos* is to be translated "without law to God," and not "wicked," as it sometimes is, then the antithesis requires that *ennomos* should be "under or within the law to Christ." I need not quote other passages in proof of my position. I conclude by referring to only one more—James ii. 9—where "respecters of persons" (and they are addressed as believers) are said to "become transgressors of the law." The truth is, then, that we must either keep the law or break it: there is no alternative. Brethren say they do the will of God, but not the law of God; but how do they know the will of God but by his law? The sum of the Decalogue is love. If you do not love, are you sinning? Does your being not under the law, but under grace, make the want of love no crime?

THE MINISTRY.

Q. What are the Brethren's objections to Ministry?

A. They hold that we put a man in the place of the Holy Ghost by appointing a minister over us, and that their meetings are held under the presidency of the Holy Ghost. They speak of ours as the "one-man ministry." They deny the right of a separate class in the Church called elders, or ministers, or bishops, to preach and rule and exercise discipline.

Q. They hold, then, that all Christians have the right of ministry?

A. Yes though Paul asks—"Are all apostles? are all prophets? *are all teachers?*" (1 Cor. xii. 29.)

Q. What say the Scriptures?

A. If the Scriptures recognize no stated ministry, why should Paul give such minute directions as to bishops, evangelists, and deacons—officers in the Apostolic Church—who, according to the Brethren, were to pass away immediately? Surely there was a distinction at one time between teachers and taught, rulers and ruled, ministers and people? else why should Paul command Christians "to remember them who have the rule over them, who have

spoken to them the Word of God?" (Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17.) Why should a separate class be called elders, bishops, stars, angels, stewards, ambassadors, unless there was a separate class? Where does Paul tell us that the ministry was to pass away—that this separate class was to cease? Will the brethren tell us at what precise period this took place? They are bound to do so. Can they prove that the gifts of ministry referred to in Romans xii. 4, 8, and 1 Peter iv. 10, 11, do not refer to the Church *in its continuance*? Did not our Lord say to an order of *teachers* that he would be with *them* to the end of the world? Why, too, should he be called the Chief Shepherd, unless there were to be under shepherds? And how long is he to be Chief Shepherd? (1 Peter v. 4.)

Q. But Ministers now-a-days are not appointed by the Holy Ghost like the elders of the apostles' days; for they were either appointed by the apostles, or by those deputed by them?

A. 1. The apostles had no other guidance of the Holy Ghost in these appointments—if they alone did appoint them—than the Church now has; else, why should they have appointed Demas? Philip baptised Simon Magus, an unconverted man; and Peter committed mistakes in his public ministry. (Gal. ii. 11.) 2. If the Holy Ghost was to appoint elders in Ephesus and Crete *through* Timothy and Titus, why should Paul have so carefully sketched the qualifications of elders or bishops in his epistles to them? This was quite unnecessary, on Plymouth principles. Was it not because they were both uninspired men? 3. The apostles did not appoint alone. Even an apostle could not be chosen *without the Church*. (Acts i.) The people in this case appointed two persons, *antecedently* to God's choice.

Q. But the ultimate choice of an apostle rested with God?

A. He selected one of the two; but, to confirm the liberty of the Church, Matthias was afterwards, as the Greek word means, "*reckoned by common suffrage among the apostles.*"

Q. But Matthias was chosen Jewishly by lot, and before the Holy Ghost was sent down; Peter had no authority for what he did. He showed his usual rashness.

A. Then it follows, of course, that Matthias was no apostle; that the apostles and disciples were all in the wrong; that though they prayed to God to say which of the two he had chosen, they were wrong in supposing that they obtained the divine sanction. Are we to be told that the apostles acted here contrary to the word and will of God? This is the Plymouth position.

Q. But we are told in Acts xiv. 23 that the apostles "ordained them elders in every church;" hence they were appointments of the Holy Ghost, unlike your modern appointments?

A. The Greek phrase is—"They ordained them elders *by election.*" Besides, this passage proves that *in every church there are to be elders*—rather unlike the Brethren, who run from church to church over the whole kingdom. Now, if elders were necessary while the apostles were still alive, surely they ought to be much more necessary now; and why were elders appointed at Antioch and other places, when the churches had been established there long before?

Q. But Timothy and Titus appointed elders without the election of the people?

A. How do you know? Why should they do differently in Ephesus and Crete from Paul and Barnabas in Acts xiv. 23?

Q. But the elders were not teachers—they were mere rulers. (1 Tim. v. 17.)

A. There were elders who ruled, and elders who taught and ruled, as your passage proves. But why do you assume that the elders ordained by Paul and Barnabas were the "ruling elders only?" They were teaching elders in Ephesus. (Acts xx. 17-28.) The Cretan elders were to be able "to exhort and convince the gainsayers." (Titus i. 9.) An elder or bishop was to be "apt to teach." (1 Tim. iii. 2.) Peter and John call themselves elders. The Plymouth idea of elders is quite unscriptural.

Q. But all the officers mentioned in Eph. iv. 11 are passed away?

A. No; the extraordinary officers are, yet their epistles remain to us. The apostles thus remain in the church: 1. This very church of Ephesus had only elders or bishops

when Paul met them at Miletus—(Acts xx. 17–28)—and no other class of officers. Thirty years after the epistle was written there was an “angel” or presiding minister at Ephesus. (Rev. ii. 1.) 2. Your argument proves too much, for it proves that “prophets” and “teachers” are gone too; and yet you hold that all God’s people are prophets and teachers. Let us calmly consider the point. *You* hold that all are alike passed away. Carry out your principle. In 1 Cor. xii. 8–10, your favourite proof-text, we read—“To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another, the gift of healing by the same Spirit; to another, the work of miracles; to another, prophecy.” Now, all these are passed away, or none. But it is admitted that the “working of miracles” and “gifts of healing” are passed away; therefore the “word of wisdom,” “the word of knowledge,” and “faith” itself, are passed away. Your passage proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. 3. Peter says the elders were “to feed the flock of God”—*until when?* Till the Chief Shepherd should appear. (1 Peter v. 4.) 4. Show us a single plain command of Scripture for setting aside the ministry. 5. Is it not a fact that ministry in our sense continued onward from apostolic days? In the days of John—the last of the apostles—there were angels or presiding ministers in the seven churches of Asia. This was about the year 95 or 96, A.D. The epistle of Paul to Ephesus was written between 63 and 65, A.D. Clement the companion of Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, blames them for ejecting certain ministers.

Q. But you have no authority for ordination. The apostles ordained elders, but you have no right to ordain them.

A. Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, or eldership, who were uninspired or ordinary officers. (1 Tim. iv. 14) 2. If the apostles, and those whom they deputed, were the only persons who ordained elders, and if ordination has passed away with them, then, as the apostles, and those whom they deputed, are the only persons known to have baptized converts, the ordinance of baptism is also passed away with them.) Baptism and

ordination thus stand or fall together. But baptism remains; therefore ordination remains.

Q. But Paul speaks of all prophesying in 1 Cor. xiv.?

A. 1. You have just told us that the apostles have passed away leading us to suppose that there are none now to occupy their place. Inspired men have ceased. The special gifts of the Spirit have ceased. Yet you have the boldness to refer to this chapter of miraculous gifts—*gifts that have admittedly passed away* as well as the apostles—to justify your Plymouth ideas of every man's right to preach! Surely, according to your argument about apostles and elders having passed away, without leaving any successors in the Church—they having been miraculously and specially guided by the Spirit—the *Corinthian prophets can have no successors either*. Your argument, if effectual against our ministry, is equally effectual against your own. 2. It is admitted that Paul spoke of a separate ministry in his first epistle to Timothy (iii.) Yet this epistle was written *six years* after his 1st epistle to the Corinthians. Is it not significant that the brethren—the most sectarian and divisive and quarrelsome sect in Christendom—should find their ideas of ministry upon the practice of a Church like that of Corinth, which was remarkable for precisely these three qualities? There was even a party "of Christ" at Corinth, like the "one assembly of God in London" founded by Mr. Darby.

Q. But if there were elders at Corinth why did not Paul write to them? He wrote to the "saints." (1 Cor. i. 1.)

A. I ask, why did he not write to the elders in his epistle to the Hebrews? For (Heb. xiii. 7-17) he said, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow." Also, "Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account." There is not a word of elders in the epistles to the Galatians; yet Peter—(compare 1 Peter i. 1 with Peter i v. 1)—says there were elders among them. Again, why, did Christ write to the angels of the Seven Churches, and not to the Churches themselves? There were prophesyings in the Thessalonian Church, where there were elders. (1

Thess. v. 12.) There were elders at Ephesus, and yet Paul does not write to them in his epistle.

Q. But surely all those Christians whom Paul mentions by name as "fellow-labourers" were really preachers?

A. I answer—1. This proves nothing against us. 2. It is evident from the case of Prisca and other godly women who laboured with the apostle—(Phil. iv. 3)—that there were many labourers *in a private way*, as women were not allowed to speak in the church. The word "fellow-labourer," applied to a male, cannot therefore imply *public* ministry.

Q. But we are all teachers now: we are a holy priesthood?

A. So were the Jews—"Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests." (Exod. xix. 6.) The Jewish princes taught. (2 Chron. xvii. 7-9; see Mal. iii. 16.) Yet there was a settled ministry among the Jews.

Q. But Paul in 2nd Timothy gave up the idea of ministry which he had enforced in 1st Timothy, on account of the errors to which it had led?

A. Where is your proof? This is one of your baseless fancies. It is an insult to the Holy Ghost to say such a thing. Paul refers to ministry most pointedly in 2 Tim. ii. 2.

Q. But we object to a man-made ministry?

A. So do we. The Holy Ghost must first give a man the call; then the people recognise his gifts, and the elders together ratify the popular choice. If the Holy Ghost appoints the ministry among the Brethren, how is it that they have false teachers, for they are separated from each other by doctrines? Plymouthism is a thing of perpetual schisms. And who are to decide upon false teaching? The people!—and they, forsooth, can set aside the man that is taught by the Holy Ghost!!

Q. Who can gainsay a minister whom the Lord sends?

A. Of course, no one, if the minister is known to be such. But how is he to be known?

Q. Every man in the assembly has a right to speak?

A. He has or he has not. If he has, and talks heresy or in a way distasteful to the assembly, would he be silenced or not? If not, would there not be a confusion as well as

connivance at heresy? If he would be silenced, you have the intervention of men, and you gainsay ministers who are sent by the Lord! Thus you have the concurrence of the assembly established, and this is tantamount to appointment or ordination.

Q. But you deny the presidency of the Holy Ghost?

A. It is not easy to understand what you mean. We know that Christ promised to be in the midst of his people when they are gathered in his name, although he nowhere says he is to be their president or pastor; but there is no passage of Scripture where the Holy Ghost is said to be the president of the assemblies, or that he is present in any other sense than he is in the hearts of the believers. But what do you make of the presidency of the Spirit when members preach heresy? Does any other member dare to take the seat of presidency and call them to order? Your idea of ministry is wholly unscriptural, fosters self-conceit, leads to endless confusion, and breeds perpetual schisms.

SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY.

Q. Do the Brethren not object to a fixed support given to the ministry?

A. Yes. 1. But Paul clearly settles the question of support. "They who preach the Gospel are to live by the Gospel." (1. Cor. ix. 14; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18; Gal. vi. 6.) 2. Plymouth teachers do not object to receive support, if it comes privately and in no stipulated proportion, as if, like Elijah, they were fed directly by Providence. But the ordinary mode of supporting the ministry is proved to be both Scriptural and reasonable. Christ says:—"The labourer is worthy of his hire"—a certain specified sum paid publicly—not whatever his employer pleases to give him. "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges?" The soldier is paid publicly a fixed sum. "Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? (1 Cor. 9.) Often the vine-keepers farmed out their vineyards at a certain fixed sum.

Q. But the ministry should not be supported except by believers? The Jewish law was: "Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore or the price of a dog into the House of the Lord thy God?" (Deut. xxiii. 18.)

A. This was a command for Jews; but follow it out. Do the Brethren mean to say that none but converted Jews contributed to the support of the tabernacle? All Jews had to give something: but on Plymouth principles they must all have been converted. Did Ezra object to a heathen king beautifying the house of the Lord? (Ezra vii. 11-28.) Are you quite sure that that Corinthian donation which Paul pled for on behalf of the Christians of Judea did not come—at least some part of it—from those errorists and sectaries whom he so severely condemns, some of whom even denied the resurrection. (1 Cor. xv.)

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

Q. What is the Plymouth doctrine on this subject?

A. That the Christian Sabbath is not of Divine authority, and that all the seven days are equally secular or equally sacred.

Q. Is not the Sabbath an exclusively Jewish institution?

A. Not at all. *It existed before the giving of the law.* It is mentioned in the 16th chapter of Exodus. The Decalogue is in the 20th chapter. What did the Lord mean when he said: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? (Exod. xvi. 28.) The existence of the Sabbath is here pre-supposed.

Q. When was it instituted?

A. In Paradise: "And the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it."—Gen. ii. 3.

Q. But this does not say that man is to observe it: it is merely that God blessed it.

A. What else does it say? Why was it sanctified, except for man? In the fourth commandment man is enjoined to rest on the Sabbath, *because* God blessed and hallowed it. (Exod. xx. 11.) The words "hallowed" and "sanctified" in the two places are the renderings of the same Hebrew word. Hence the word in Exodus determines the meaning of the word in Genesis.

Q. But Christ never alluded to it in His Sermon on the Mount?

A. Did he not? Surely it was included in that law which "he came not to destroy but to fulfil." He did not

allude specifically to *other* commandments. But he did refer to the Sabbath again and again in his public teachings.

Q. But why have you altered the day from the seventh to the first day of the week?

A. This is a question for you to settle with the apostles. *They made the change.* It was a change predicted. (Psalm cxviii. 24.) The change did not affect the obligation of the Sabbath. They were inspired: therefore they must have known what was essential to the Sabbath law.

Q. But a moral law is unchangeable in its very nature?

A. The fourth commandment is both moral and positive. It admits, as Christ showed, of works of necessity and mercy: yet these are not *specifically* included in it. When the disciples rubbed the ears of corn on the Sabbath, Christ did not admit that they had broken the law, but maintained by reference to the Old Testament that *these exceptions were part of the law.* (Matt. xii. 1-5; 1 Sam. xxi. 6.)

Q. Yet the alteration of the day seems to alter the law?

A. What does the Fourth Commandment require? It is the observance of one day in seven, not the observance of the seventh day, though that *was* the day of observance. The commandment is not "Remember the *seventh* day to keep it holy," but "Remember the *Sabbath* day."

Q. But if you are consistent you will stone the Sabbath-breaker, and not light fires on the Sabbath?

A. Where does the Fourth Commandment require this? Nowhere. The civil law of the Israelites required it, and not any other law. We are not under that law.

Q. But was not the Sabbath a "shadow of things to come" a sign of spiritual blessings?

A. So was marriage (Eph. v. 25-33); but *it* is still something more than a shadow or a figure. It did not pass away after it became a sign of the mystical union between Christ and believers.

Q. But Paul says:—"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike." (Rom. xiv. 5.)

A. The converted Jews—along with the Lord's Day, and Baptism, and the Lord's Supper—also observed the seventh day, the Passover, and Circumcision, and it was their wish to force this double system on the Gentiles. And when

Paul speaks of "days, months, times, years," the Lord's Day was not in question at all, because about its observance there was no dispute whatever in the Christian churches. Would Paul be likely to condemn his own practice? The same remark applies to Col. ii. 16.

Q. But we keep every day as a holy day?

A. You do not; for you observe the Lord's Supper only once a week, not seven days in the week. But it was true of the pious Hebrews before Christ's time as of Christians since, that they kept every day holy in your sense.

Q. Some of us observe the Sunday as Resurrection-day, in memory of that event?

A. But one Sabbath in the year will answer just as well for that purpose as fifty-two.

Q. What other evidence do you bring!

A. John says—"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day. (Rev. i. 10.) This does not imply that *he* esteemed every day alike, but it does imply that the Jewish Sabbath was gone. Christ said:—"Pray that your flight may not be on the Sabbath day. (Matt. xxiv. 20) That flight was to be forty years afterwards, when the Jewish Sabbath was forever passed away. Christ would not teach an error; therefore there would be a Sabbath day after the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath. Remember too, that the day of Pentecost—the inauguration day of the Christian Church—always fell on our Sunday; and besides, that the religious services of the apostles and early Christians had a marked connection with the first day of the week. (Acts. i. 14; xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 1, 2.) The first day is the only day ever mentioned by *number* in the New Testament.

THE CHURCH.

Q. What is the Brethren's doctrine on this subject?

A. That the Church had no existence till the day of Pentecost: and that, therefore, the Jews were not a Church. Yet Stephen speaks of "the Church in the wilderness (Acts vii. 38;) and the word *kahal* in Hebrew, translated "congregation," exactly corresponds to "Church" in the New Testament, and is so rendered in the Septuagint version. Hence, I infer there was a Church in the Old Testa-

ment. There is no hint in the Scripture of a new thing called the Church commencing at Pentecost. Besides, the covenant that God made with Abraham is the same covenant under which we live, with great circumstantial diversities:—"That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." (Gal. iii. 14.) Remember, too, that it is the *same* "vineyard" out of which the Jewish husbandmen were cast into which we gentiles have entered. Jesus said—"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. xxi. 43.) It is ridiculous to say that the Old Testament saints did not belong to the Church of Christ, "for he loved it, and gave himself for it." (Eph. v. 25.) Did he not love and give himself for the saints referred to in Heb. xi. ?

Q. But Christ said—"On this rock will I build my Church." The Church was not yet built ?

A. He speaks of the Church in its New Testament organization, for we are told in Eph. ii. 20—"Ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." The foundation is laid in Old Testament prophets, and Christ is corner-stone, according to Isaiah xxviii. 16, and Psalm cxviii. 22. The Church was thus founded *before* New Testament times.

Q. What further evidence can you bring ?

A. Isaiah represents the Jewish Church as enlarging itself for the reception of the Gentile converts (liv. 2, 3, and lx. 4-5), and Amos (ix. 11), quoted by James at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 15), represents the Christian Church, not as the erection of a new tabernacle, but as the setting up again of the tabernacle of David which had fallen down. Paul says to the Gentiles—"Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee," showing it is Israel's old olive tree on which the Gentile Church has been grafted. This cannot refer to the invisible Church, for no branch was ever broken off from it, but to the Church as an organized and visible community. (Rom. xi. 18.) "The Gentiles are to be fellow-heirs and of the same body," thus showing that believing Jews under the Old Testament dispensation, and believing Gentiles under the New Testament, belonged to the same body, the Church, which is called Christ's body. (Eph. i. 23 ; Eph.

iii. 6.). Christ says of Jews and Gentiles—"There shall be *one fold and one Shepherd.*" (John x. 16.) And when Peter calls Christians "a royal priesthood," &c., he is using words *first* applied to Israel. (Exod. xix. 5, 6; Deut. vii. 6.) The identity is clearly established in I Cor. x.

Q. But there can be no unity between the Jewish and Christian Churches, for the one admitted by its constitution only carnal members, and the other only spiritual members!

A. I answer: 1. Carnal descent from Abraham did not entitle to membership, for the Edomites, Midianites, and Ishmaelites, were not members. 2. Even an Israelite might forfeit his position in many ways. 3. The Church in Old Testament times consisted of professing believers and their children, just like the Church now. Faith was necessary in both cases. 4. Bad men have entered both Churches. No perfect visible communion ever existed, even in apostolic days.

Q. What is the Brethren's doctrine concerning communion?

A. That the visible Church consists of none but converted people, and that believers should hold no religious fellowship or pray with unbelievers.

Q. But is not the Scripture principle, that "separation from evil is God's principle of unity." (Darby.)

A. I answer: 1. A common rejection of error does not afford a centre of union. Romanists and Protestants equally reject Socinianism, but this rejection cannot unite them. A common affection is a principle of union. 2. The idea leads to mischievous and divisive consequences: it separates true brethren, for one brother sees evil where another sees none. 3. It makes man his brother's judge; it seizes on the evil and passes by the good; and it makes one wiser and holier than the Lord, departing where he abides.

Q. But is it not said: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate?"

A. This is used by you to justify separation from all the Churches. But the Brethren fell into the still greater evil of refusing communion with those whom Jesus loves and blesses, and of saying hard things of those they admit to be

brethren in those Churches, imputing to them wrong motives, want of integrity, ignorance, disobedience to light, they forget other Scriptures equally binding—"Speak not evil of one another, brethren;" "Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him;" "Love thinketh no evil."

Q. But the duty of separation is perpetual?

A. It is clear that sins of uncleanness were very common among the Gentile converts; else why should Paul say, "Flee fornication?" And yet if the Churches consisted only of saints, why should he have addressed them in this way? Discipline was to be exercised, but separation on account of such sins is never enjoined.

Q. What is your opinion of the doctrine of a perfect Church—a Church of saints?

A. There is no authority in Scripture for it, even were such a thing *possible* as a perfect Church on earth. John Newton once said to a lady with ideas of a pure Church, "Well, madam, if there were a perfect Church on earth, it would cease to be so the moment you and I entered it." The Brethren have no infallible power of discerning spirits any more than their neighbours. Were Annanias and Sapphira true believers? Yet they belonged to the visible Church. Were the Seven Churches of Asia perfect and spotless? The Lord did not command his saints to come out from these Churches, though there was the presence of error as well as ungodliness, but enjoined them to cast out the evil elements. He did not bid his saints first to separate from the professing Churches in order to witness for him. Were not unbelievers present in the congregations at Corinth? (1 Cor. xiv. 23.) Were the services stopped at the entrance of unbelievers? "Some had not the knowledge of God." (1 Cor. xv. 34.) What is the meaning of "If any one who is *called* a brother be a fornicator"—(1 Cor. v. 11)—if the communion was perfectly pure? There were errorists who denied the Resurrection, sectarians who rent the body of Christ, and "false apostles transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." Does not Jude speak of "ungodly men turning the grace of God into lasciviousness?" Luke, of men "troubling the Church with words, subverting their

souls." (Acts xv. 24.) Were these men not in communion with the Church? Were they not mixed up with believers? Who were they of whom John said. "They went from us because they were not of us?" Had they not been previously in communion with them! In Titus ii. 20, the Church is represented as a great house with vessels, some to honour and some to dishonour—implying the presence of saints and hypocrites in the same Church. The Plymouth principle is not new. The Donatists held that mixed communions were infectious, that the godly were to separate from the society of the ungodly, and, as Darby does, that the Churches were prostitute and fallen. Donatism fell about 600 A. D., through its own dissensions. Fuller says:—"There remained not two of them that were together." How like the Brethren!

Q. Where is there Scripture authority for your distinction between the Church visible and the Church invisible?

A. There is but one Church, no doubt, spoken of in Scripture, and not two Churches. The terms visible and invisible had their origin in the well-known facts, that all who profess to be believers are not really such, and that the human mind is not omniscient. The visible Church is just the Church as seen by man; the invisible, the Church as seen by the All-Seeing. Are the Brethren infallibly assured that every Plymouth Brother is a true believer? If they are not, it follows, as a matter of course, that the Church as seen and judged by themselves, is different from the the Church as approved by God. Paul makes the distinction clearly between the visible and the invisible Church when he speaks of "Israel after the flesh" and "Israel after the Spirit."

Q. The Brethren, then, will have no family worship as it is generally conducted?

A. No. They exclude their children and their servants if they believe them to be unconverted, though it is hard to see why Paul prayed to God in "presence of all the ship's company," at a common meal—(Acts xxviii. 35)—or why little children should have united with their parents in prayer. (Acts xxi. 5.) It is well known that a Plymouth Brother will not say grace if all at the table are not believed

to be converted. The Plymouth principle divides not only in their public gatherings, but even in their family relationships, sister refusing communion with sister, and child with parent.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND PRAYER.

Q. What is the Plymouth doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit?

A. That he did not exist in the Church till the day of Pentecost, and that, being once given, it is wrong for believers to pray *for* the Spirit.

Q. How do you meet this opinion?

A. It was the Holy Spirit who formed the sinless nature of Jesus. (Luke i. 34.) The ministry, miracles, death and resurrection of Christ are all spoken of in connection with the Holy Spirit. (Acts x. 38; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Timothy. iii. 17.) This was all *before* Pentecost. See also John xx. 22—"He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The Spirit existed in the Church before the day of Pentecost, for Peter says—"Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," (1 Peter i. 21), and he speaks of "the Spirit of Christ" in the prophets, "when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (See also Heb. iii. 7; ix. 8; Mark xii. 36; Luke iii. 22; Psalm li. 11.)

Q. But Christ said—"If I go not away, the Spirit will not come to you," implying that he was not yet in the Church?

A. The prophecy of Joel (ii. 28) explains the matter. It was not the *existence* or the *coming*, but the *extraordinary effusion* of the Spirit that was the burden of Old Testament prophecy. The Spirit was to inaugurate a new dispensation with remarkable signs—viz., speaking with tongues, working of miracles, and multitudinous conversions. When Joel spoke of the "Spirit being poured out on all flesh," he was not ignorant of the Spirit's existence and work, for it was by him that he was inspired to prophesy. (1 Pet. i. 21.)

Q. But we are told in Acts xix. 1-6 of certain disciples of John at Ephesus who had not even heard that there was a Holy Ghost?

A. 1. As John's disciples, they could not be ignorant of the Spirit's *existence*, for, in baptizing them, he told them of One "who would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire." 2. The meaning is that they had not heard whether the Holy Ghost had been *given*; and no sooner did he fall upon them than these disciples (believers, be it remembered "spake with tongues and prophesied." In John vii. 39 we read—"and the Holy Ghost was not yet"—meaning, not yet given in the visible or signal manner intended. (Acts ii. 1.) The Greek construction is the same in both passages.

Q. But why should we pray for the Holy Ghost since he has been already given? It is a mockery to ask God to repeat the gift.

A. Christ says—"How much more shall your heavenly Father give His Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke xi. 13.) If it be wrong to ask for the Spirit because he was given eighteen centuries ago, it is wrong to ask any spiritual blessing or gift, for they were all given in the gift of Christ. The Spirit was actually prayed for in Acts viii. 15. It is no mockery to ask God to repeat his gift, for Paul prays for the Ephesian Christians, who had already received the Spirit, that God might "give them the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him" (Eph. i. 17), and says, "Be ye filled with the Spirit." (Eph. v. 18.)

Q. Does not the aid of the Spirit preclude the use of human means for the understanding of the Scriptures—for example, Commentaries on the Bible?

A. No. The Brethren decry commentaries, but they write commentaries, and tracts, and treatises of their own. One of them has written a commentary on Leviticus. What are all Plymouth tracts and treatises but commentaries on Scripture? A commentary from the lips of a preacher cannot become false by being printed in a book. The eunuch was in want of a commentary when he said to Philip—"How can I understand it, except some man should guide me?"

Q. What is the Brethren's doctrine concerning prayer?

A. That unconverted men ought not to pray for mercy, and while believers only should pray, they must not confess sin or ask its pardon, as their sin has already been put away eighteen hundred years ago by the death of Christ.

Q. What answer do you make to the first statement?

A. It is the *duty* of an unconverted man to pray, for his moral incapacity for prayer will not free him from the obligation to pray. (Acts viii. 21-23; Isaiah lv. 6, 7; Ps. lxxv. 21.) Besides, the neglect of prayer is charged as his sin. (Zeph. i. 6; Hosea vii. 7; Jer. x. 21; Psalm cxli. 2-4; x. 4; lxxix. 6; Jer. x. 25.) Besides we have instances of wicked men praying and God hearing them. (1st Kings xxi. 19; Jonah iii. 4; 2 Chron. xxvi. 5.)

Q. But does not the Scripture say—"The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord?"

A. Yes; and everything else he does. Even "the ploughing of the wicked" is sin. But no one would say, he ought not to plough, or to read the Scriptures. Again the wicked should not eat or drink, any more than pray, for they are required—(1 Cor. x. 31)—to do these to the glory of God; but this they cannot do.

Q. What, then, is the meaning of the Brethren's statement?

A. They say a sinner should not pray for salvation, but take it without praying, as if the things were inconsistent. What is the difference between "praying for" and "taking" salvation? Is it possible to take salvation without expressing a desire for it? And is not prayer oftentimes the first utterance of faith? Our Lord, in talking with the Samaritan woman, says—"If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, give me to drink, thou wouldst have *asked* of him, and he would have given thee living water." (John iv. 10.) And did not Peter tell the unregenerate Simon Magus to "repent of his wickedness and pray God, if, perhaps, the thought of his heart might be forgiven him." (Acts viii. 22.) Were not the dying thief and the publican under a law-work when they prayed? Was it not after the prayer that they were justified? See also, Isaiah lv. 6, 7—"Call ye upon him while he is near." If a man is not to pray till he has faith how is he to know when to begin to pray! Is a man's faith always so strong and so tangible that he can be conscious of it *before* he has used it, and thus sure that he will not be committing sin if he prays? But if a sinner take salvation before he prays,

and does so because he has not faith to pray, then *he is saved before he has faith, and is of course not justified by faith.* The Brethren counsel the sinner against praying, because prayer implies faith, and yet exhort him to take salvation, which is impossible without faith. According to Plymouth principles, a sinner can never either believe or pray. The matter simply stands thus:—Is the sinner, *prior* to the exercise of a saving faith, in a regenerate or unregenerate state? If regenerated, then faith cannot have been the instrument of his salvation. If unregenerate, how is it that the *faith* of an unregenerate man can be acceptable to God when nothing else can be?

Q. But you put prayer in the place of believing? For nothing can ever come before believing?

A. The word of God puts itself before believing, and represents itself as a means of conversion: “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God.” (1 Peter, i. 23.) Yet it does not follow that a man is to believe before he reads the Scriptures, though he is said to be “begotten by the Word.” The Scriptures do not exclude the intervention of means in regeneration.

REPENTANCE.

Q. What is their doctrine concerning repentance?

A. It has no place whatever in their *preaching*, except when they warn sinners in this way: “You need not repent—it is not necessary—only come to Christ—repentance hinders the sinner from coming to Christ.” One calls it trash, legalism, and salvation by works. This is surely unlike the apostles’ style: “Repent and believe the Gospel.” Peter ought not to have told the sorcerer to repent of his wickedness.

Q. Are these statements not opposed to Scripture?

A. They are. Repentance in Scripture, so far from being a hindrance to coming, is the *actual way of a sinner coming to Christ*; whether it be that the sinner “come trembling,” “come weeping,” or “wept bitterly,” or “came to himself.”—Christ never said, “Come to me, you that don’t care about your sins,” or “Don’t repent till you come; but

he does say, "Except ye repent ye shall perish." We never read in Scripture of an impenitent believer or a penitent unbeliever.

Q. What, then, is the relation of faith to repentance?

A. They cannot be separated. Repentance is the tear-drop in the eye of faith. (Joel ii. 12.) In the order of nature, faith must be first; but in the order of 'time they spring up together.

Q. But you bring a saved heart to Christ?

A. No, indeed. The jailor, the dying thief, the prodigal, the publican, Mary Magdalene, did not bring a saved, but penitent, heart to Christ. Their repentance was the way of their coming, and was therefore no barrier in the way. Not one of them all, nor of the three thousand pricked to the heart, ever said, "I'll not leave off my sins till I know I am pardoned."

Q. What, then, do the Brethren make of repentance?

A. It is with them a mere change of mind in regard to God and the Gospel. "You once thought," they say, "that God is angry with you: that is a mistake; he loves you just as you are, sins and all. Believe this, and it will change your mind towards God." This is repentance. Yet it is certainly something more than this. The Brethren make repentance and faith virtually one and the same thing, for surely faith, too, is a change of mind. The 51st Psalm indicates something more; and Paul had no idea of a repentance without sorrow when he wrote (2 Cor. vii. 9. 10) concerning a godly sorrow and repentance not to be repented of. There is no repentance for *sin* in the Brethren's theology; there is a change of mind in regard to God, and nothing more. Some make repentance to be regeneration.

Q. But do the Brethren really hold that believers ought not to confess their sins or pray for pardon?

A. They do, on the ground that they have no sins to confess, for these have been put away eighteen hundred years ago! Consequently, they will not repeat the Lord's Prayer, which has come to a poor pass; for, according to the Brethren, no unconverted man can say it, as he cannot call God his Father; and no converted man, as he has no trespass to be forgiven! Who, then, *are* to use it? But if we

are not to mourn for sin committed, because it is pardoned, why should we be adverse to committing sin, since it is pardoned before it is committed? How, too, is it that Paul, a converted man, calls himself the "chief of sinners?" What does John mean when he says—"If a man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask for him." (1 John v. 16.) Why should it be right to ask for a sinning brother, and not for our sinning selves?

Q. Do the Scriptures countenance this view?

A. No; John says—"If we confess our sins"—speaking of believers—"he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John v. 16.) Was David not a converted man when he penned the 51st Psalm! Yet it is full of confession.

JUSTIFICATION.

Q. What is the Brethren's doctrine on this subject?

A. They hold that believers are justified from eternity, or from the time of Christ's death, and that faith has nothing more to do with our justification than merely to bring the fact of it to our knowledge. They deny the imputed righteousness of Christ, which is the ground of our justification; and though they hold that Christ suffered in our stead, they deny that he obeyed the law in our stead.

Q. What do you say upon this subject?

A. With regard to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, it is clearly taught in Rom. v. 17, 18; iii. 22; Phil. iii. 8, 9; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Jer. xxiii. 6. And if Christ did not fulfil the law for us, what does Paul mean by saying—"For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Christ) shall many be made righteous." (Rom. v. 19.) This was not obedience to suffering, but to law, for it stands in opposition to the "disobedience of Adam," which had relation only to law. What, again, does Paul mean by "the righteousness of one" (v. 18.)? It cannot be obedience to suffering. Christ himself explained it when he said he must "fulfill all righteousness." (Matt. iii. 15.) Paul says the object of Christ's coming was that "the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us"—(Rom. viii. 4)—*i.e.*, which the

law required of us—the duties of obedience. Christ, too, was “made under the law” for us—*i.e.*, as Paul explains—(Gal. iv. 21)—not under its curse, but its obligation to obedience. Why, indeed, should a sinless man be put under the law at all, unless he stood for us? If he did not obey the law in our stead, he might have come directly from heaven to the cross of Calvary, and not lived so many years upon earth.

Q. What do you say concerning sinners being justified from eternity or from the time of Christ’s death?

A. The Brethren speak of our sins as being “put away,” “laid upon Jesus,” “borne away,” “atoned for,” as if the sins of all believers—past, present, and future—were actually forgiven when Christ died. They will not use the Lord’s Prayer, because they have no “trespasses to be forgiven :” *they* were forgiven eighteen hundred years ago on the cross.

1. They err by confounding atonement with pardon, for atonement is not pardon, but supplies the ground or reason of forgiveness. 2. If the sins of a believer were actually pardoned before he was born, in what sense can such an individual ever have been guilty? 3. *Besides if he* was actually forgiven *before* he believed, how is faith at all necessary to his salvation? 4. But let us ask, Whose sins were actually pardoned when Christ died? Those of believers, or those of all mankind? If those of all mankind, then all are actually saved. 5. According to this doctrine, a murderer whom God pardons has not broken the sixth commandment. Peter committed no sin in denying his Lord, and Paul in persecuting the saints. Those who hold that the believer is justified from eternity must hold that God was not displeased with Abraham’s idolatry before his conversion, or with Manasseh’s bloody doings, for their sins were pardoned before they were born; neither was David guilty of murder and adultery, nor was Nathan justified in rebuking the King. 6. A man is not justified till he believes, for Paul says—(Acts xiii. 39)—“By him all that believe are justified from all things.” 7. We cannot be justified before we believe, for we are damned before we believe—“He that believeth not is condemned already.” (John iii. 18.) Paul says of certain Corinthians,—“Such were some of you; but

ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified." (1 Cor. vi. 9.) This implies that at one time they were not justified." 8. Paul says—"Those whom he called, them he also justified." The calling always precedes the justification. 9. This doctrine involves the absurdity that a man can be born again before he is born at all. 10. It involves, too, the following conclusion—that, as all sin is put away by Christ there can be nothing at any time against any sinner in the Book of God.

SANCTIFICATION.

Q. What is imputed sanctification?

A. It is the doctrine of the Brethren that we are sanctified as well as justified in Christ; that all believers are sanctified in him in a sense that excludes all personal and progressive sanctification; that they are perfectly holy the moment they believe, and they never become more holy.

Q: What do you think of the doctrine?

A. It is sheer absurdity to talk of *imputed* sanctification. You cannot speak even of imputed justification. You can of imputed righteousness. Justification is not imputed—it is conferred.

Q. But Paul says—"Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption?" (1 Cor. i. 20.)

A. He does not say that sanctification is by *imputation*. You could as readily prove imputed wisdom and imputed redemption. According to this logic, our redemption, which includes our glorification, is as complete now as our justification.

Q. But does not Paul say—"By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified?" (Heb. x. 14.)

A. I answer—1. He does not say that Christ perfected their sanctification. He makes a clear distinction between the "perfecting" and the "sanctification." 2. He is not here speaking of perfecting them in holiness at all. He says the Jewish sacrifices offered year by year "could not make the comers thereunto perfect"—in what sense? *In the sense of taking away their sins, and their having no more conscience for sin.* Therefore, the "one offering" of Christ

made them perfect in this sense, and in this sense alone. 3. The word "sanctified" always means in Hebrew not "made holy" but "dedicated or consecrated to God" by Christ's offering of himself. (Heb. xx. 13; x. 10, 14, 29; xiii. 12.) Therefore, there is no ground in this passage for your idea of imputed sanctification.

Q. How do they fall into this error?

A. They use the word sanctification in its Old Testament sense of consecration, and declare that men are perfectly sanctified when they believe, meaning that they are regarded as perfectly holy for Christ's sake. This is more like justification than sanctification. We admit that, in one sense, sanctification is an act—a thing done at once—like justification—that the moment a man believes he becomes "clean"—(John xv. 3)—that there is a complete consecration (like that of the Jewish priest) through Christ's blood. It is thus we understand 1 Cor. i. 2—"Sanctified in Jesus Christ." If this be their meaning, they are playing with words, but if they mean by it a perfect freedom from sin, and that the sins of believers are not sins at all, they are the enemies of godliness and the inciters of crime. We are consecrated by the blood that we may be purified inwardly by the Holy Spirit. The vessels of the sanctuary were at once separated to God's service, but that did not imply that they did not need a daily ablution. That sanctification is properly a gradual process the Scripture uniformly affirms. (2 Peter iii. 18; Hosea xiv. 5; 1 Thes. v. 23; 2 Cor. iv. 16.)

Q. What is their doctrine on "the old man and the new man?"

A. That the Holy Ghost creates a new individual, perfectly holy, inserts him into us, leaving the whole of our old being untouched and unchanged to wage war with the new individual dropped into us.

Q. What is their usual way of putting the doctrine?

A. They say that the design of the Spirit is not to improve or sanctify the flesh or the old man—that the flesh in a believer is no better than in an unbeliever, and no better at the end of a saint's life than at the beginning—that the flesh, being crucified, dead and buried with Christ, is not to be exhumed—and that the error of the churches has always

been to try the mending of the old Adam nature, which is not to be mended but crucified. They thus deny all personal and progressive sanctification.

Q. How do you meet their views?

A. Let us ask, what *does* the Spirit sanctify? Not the old man, for he is unchangeable; not the new man, for he is perfect and sinless. *They, therefore, deny the Spirit's sanctifying work.* 2. Their views are immoral, for they free the saint from all responsibility for sin committed. The new man cannot sin; and the old man, dead and buried with Christ, is not to be changed. If the old man is accountable for sin, who receives the pardon? Not the new man, for he cannot sin. Therefore it must be the old man, who confesses his sins and is washed in the blood. 3. There is no room in this doctrine for "the inward man to be renewed day by day"—(2 Cor. iv. 16)—for it is as perfect as it can be at conversion. 4. If, as we are told, "the old man was crucified with Christ"—not in Paul's, but the Brethren's sense—then, as the same person that went down into the grave with Christ also rose with him, it follows that the old man now sits with him in heavenly places.

Q. But does not Paul speak of "the old man being crucified with Christ"—(Rom. iv. 6)—and also of the new man?

A. He does. But Paul tells us that *he himself* was crucified with Christ—(Gal. ii. 20)—not two Pauls, but one—that *he* was buried and rose with him. There were two conflicting elements within him, but still only one responsible self. Law and self were nailed to the cross—not to be annihilated, but to come forth in a new form. He was begotten again—not by a new man being dropped into him—but by *his becoming a new creature.* The Brethren err by too strict literality. How could they explain 2 Cor. v. 7—"Old things are passed away, behold all things are become new? How can the old man pass away? Is he not unchangeable, and is he not with us till death? No doubt, in a *legal* sense he is unchangeable—*i.e.*, the members of the old man—"seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds," showing in one sense, he is put off at conversion; in another, he is put off gradually—by mortification.

Q. But does not Paul say—"It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me?"

A. Your conclusion, then, is, that sin in a believer is not sin at all. But Paul does not deny his responsibility or personality. This is his way of speaking—(Gal. ii. 20.)—"I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." (1 Cor. vii. 10; xv. 10; Matt. xx. 20.)

Q. But does not John say—"Whosoever is born of God sinneth not?"

A. 1. John never said the believer could not commit sin. He says the reverse. (1 John i. 6, 7.) 2. But that being born of God is the only way of deliverance from sin. 3. See similar statements. (Rom. xiv. 7; xiii. 4; John vii. 7; viii. 43; ix. 4, 12, 39.)

FAITH AND ASSURANCE.

Q. What is the Brethren's doctrine of faith?

A. They hold that "it is just believing what God has said about Jesus." But this is a mere historical belief—the mere credence of testimony. Tens of thousands believe all the facts of the Gospel just as they believe the facts of Roman history, and yet are still unconverted. This is dead faith—the faith of devils—"who believe and tremble." (James ii. 17, 19.) If this be true faith, then I can believe without the help of the Holy Spirit. The faith of the Brethren is believing "that Christ died for me." A believer is *not* one who is saved because he believes he is saved.

Q. What is their usual way of putting the case?

A. "A man is not called presumptuous, because, when God tells him the world was drowned by a flood, he believes it; and yet if a man, *on the same testimony* (?), believes that he has the pardon of his sins, and acknowledges it, he is called presumptuous." But surely God has nowhere in the world told A. B. that his sins are forgiven, as he revealed the fact of the flood. I can show chapter and verse for the flood. Show me chapter and verse for the pardon of A. B.

Q. But does not John say "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life?"

A. Yes ; every believer hath everlasting life ; but the passage does not tell me that you are a believer. I have only your testimony upon that point. I have no divine testimony upon it. Your own statement—"I am a believer"—is not equivalent to a divine statement to that effect.

Q. But if a man owes a debt in London, and a friend pays it for him, he can have no peace till he knows that it is paid ?

A. But surely if the debt is really paid, he is safe, though he still may be wanting in comfort. If you tell a roomful of people that their debt is paid or their sin put away, you can tell them that they are saved—that is, they are saved before they believe. If you preach this to all men, you are a Universalist at once, and teach that all men without exception will be finally saved. Whose debt to the last farthing did Christ pay upon Calvary ? Was it that of his elect, as of all sinners as such ? You say the debt of *all* sinners. Then, I ask, how *any* sinner can by any possibility be damned ? If the sinner's debt was paid before he was born, it is surely a fact, whether he believes it or not, or hears of it or not. The Brethren make no distinction between a weak faith and a strong faith. They confound the certainty of the things to be believed with the assurance we have of them. The one is always the same ; the other is proportioned to the strength of our faith.

Q. But unbelief is the damning sin ?

A. Well, but the debt that Christ paid for every sinner includes unbelief in it, or it does not. If it does, the debt cannot be paid and remain due at the same time.

Q. But doubting is condemned. If I don't believe in God's Word, I make him a liar ?

A. The doubting which Scripture condemns is not doubting our own safety, but doubting whether what God has said be true. To doubt whether I am a Christian or not does not make God a liar, for he has nowhere said I am so.

Q. But does not faith consist in believing that Christ died for me ?

A. Not at all. That is assurance, which all saints should strive to attain, as Paul did—(2 Tim. i. 12)—but all have not this assurance.

Q. But my assurance does not depend upon self-examination. That mars my peace. I look to Christ, and I don't pore into the muddy depths of my soul?

A. You are quite right to look to Christ for comfort as well as pardon, but if you neglect self-examination you oppose the tenor of Scripture command. (1 John 2, 3; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 1.) Paul supposes the possibility of self-deception in Gal. vi. 3. The Brethren say that holy works are not necessary to evidence faith to an individual; but Paul says—(Heb. vi. 9-11)—“that ye do show the same diligence *unto* the full assurance of hope unto the end.” They say, too, that holy duties or holy affections are no evidence, for they may deceive us and be in hypocrites. But so may faith deceive us. Are there not false faiths as well as false loves? Paul commands us to work our salvation with fear and trembling—advice quite unnecessary on Plymouth principles. Our doctrine then is, *possunt et debent*—believers *can* and *ought* to have this assurance, but it is different from faith, and is not of the essence of faith.

BELIEVER BAPTISM.

Q. What is the position of the Brethren upon this question?

A. They re-baptize all their converts, for they are usually Baptists in doctrine. They are therefore, opposed to the baptism of infants, though that has been the practice of the Church for eighteen centuries.

Q. But do they not imitate the apostles, who immediately baptized their converts?

A. Remember that their converts were those who had been Jews and heathens till their conversion. We act similarly in our foreign mission field. Your reference to the apostles does not meet the question, “What is to be done with believers' children? Show us an instance in the Bible of the child of Christian parents being allowed to grow up to manhood without being baptized. The Jews when they made proselytes to their religion, always baptized them *with their children*, and then circumcised them. So that household baptism is what we would expect to read of in the New Testament.

Q. Why, then, was Christ not baptized in childhood ?

A. For a very good reason : because baptism had not been instituted. You could as easily argue against the circumcision of infants, because Abraham was not circumcised till he was a hundred years old ; or ask, Why did not Noah eat the Passover ? or John the Baptist keep the Lord's Supper ? But John's baptism was not Christian baptism ; for those baptized by John were baptized over again. (Acts xiv. 1-5.) If the Baptists quote the baptism of Christ, they must hold that no Believer should be baptised till he is thirty years of age.

Q. But an infant cannot understand baptism ?

A. It does not understand the nature of its mother's milk, and yet that milk nourishes it. The children that Jesus blessed—(Mark x. 13-16)—did not understand his act, yet his blessing must have done them good. But the circumcised Jewish infant of eight days old knew nothing of the nature of circumcision, though it was "a seal of the righteousness of faith." (Rom. iv. 11.)

Q. There is no command or example in the Scriptures for infant baptism ?

A. There is no command or example for admitting females to the Lord's Supper ?

Q. But faith is necessary to baptism, and infants cannot believe ?

A. Faith, too, is necessary to salvation. Therefore, they cannot be saved ? If the want of faith shuts an infant out of the Church, the want of faith shuts an infant out of heaven. Where the Scripture speaks of the necessity of faith in order to baptism, it refers to adults only, for they only are capable of faith. You require to prove that God demands the same qualification from an infant as he does from an adult.

Q. But you baptize children, and profess faith for them, and they grow up unbelievers. You act a lie.

A. You baptize adults, who profess faith themselves, and yet turn out *to be* unbelievers. You and they acted a lie together. And if they should afterwards come to repentance, *do you baptize them over again ?* Ought Simon Magus to have been baptized over again ?

Q. But why, then, do you not allow children to partake of the Lord's Supper?

A. They are members of the Church without it. Besides, infant communion has no sanction from the Word of God. A child is a citizen of the state, but as a child, he cannot vote or exercise the right of citizenship.

Q. But is there any evidence for infant baptism? I can see nothing but believer-baptism in the Scripture?

A. We see in the very constitution of our nature that the parent represents the child while the child is unable to act for itself. The children were always included in the Old Testament covenants. (Deut. xxx. 9-13.) They were within the covenant and in visible membership with the Church of God nearly two thousand years before Christ. All the male infants were circumcised. Christianity did not put them out of Covenant.

Q. But circumcision was not a religious ordinance, but a mere mark of carnal descent. It was a pledge of the possession of Canaan and of earthly blessings?

A. 1. It introduced the subject of it to religious privileges, and is called by Paul a "seal of the righteousness of faith." (Rom. iv. 11.) It was a sign of regeneration, or, as Paul says, "the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh." (Col. ii. 11.) 2. The Ishmaelites, Edomites, and Midianites came from Abraham by carnal descent, and were also circumcised; yet they were to possess no part of Canaan. Circumcision thus had primary and special reference to the spiritual covenant. 3. It was the seal of a covenant, in which "all the families of the earth were to be blessed."

Q. But circumcision of the flesh in the Old Testament corresponded to circumcision of heart in the New Testament?

A. The argument fails, for circumcision of heart was enjoined upon the Jew as well. (Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6.)

Q. But an irreligious Jew, if he had been circumcised, could partake of the Passover?

A. He must have preparation of the heart. (Isaiah i.) That was demanded. "Circumcise the foreskin of your heart." (Deut. x. 15, 16; Jer. iv. 4.) The distinction between "Israel after the flesh" and "Israel after the Spirit" existed in Old Testament times, as much as it does now.

Q. But why do you baptize females at all, seeing they were not circumcised?

A. Females were included with males in the covenants of the Old Testament. Besides, the Christian economy is larger and wider. There is "neither male nor female" in Christ Jesus.

Q. But show us evidence in the New Testament?

A. We answer—The Church membership of infants has never been set aside, and we are not bound to produce from the New Testament any express statute re-affirming their membership. The believing parents were taken in, but the children were not excluded. Paul says—Where even one parent is a believer, "the children are holy" (I Cor. vii. 14), and John writes to little children as members of the Christian Church. (I John ii. 13.) Let the Baptist show us a single passage in which the right of infants to Church membership has been abrogated in the New Testament. That he never can.

Q. Your argument is nullified by the apostolic commission—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here "teach" or "make disciples of" all nations comes before baptizing; therefore, infants are necessarily excluded?

A. We answer—1. The commission does not read, "Make disciples of all nations, *and* baptize them," but "make disciples, baptizing and teaching." The teaching is to follow the baptism. Infants cannot thus be excluded. 2. The nations include "infants." If he had said, "Circumcise all nations," would the Jews have understood him to exclude infants?

Q. But is not faith actually necessary in order to baptism in the New Testament.

A. A *profession* of faith was all that was necessary; for the baptized were in many instances strangers to those who "baptized" them. Yet the apostles baptized them, though they had been Jews up to that moment, without inquiring into their past history or into the sincerity of their profession. In no case was it said there was inquiry or delay for the purpose of inquiry.

Q. But the apostles had no need to inquire: they were inspired, and could discern spirits?

A. Why, then, did Philip baptize Simon Magus, who was not a true believer? On the Baptist principle that there is no baptism without faith, the baptizer can never be sure that the ordinance is valid, for he cannot be certain of the professor's faith. If there be no baptism without faith, then large numbers of Baptists are unbaptized, for they were dipped while they were still unconverted. Remember above all things, that *the baptism of proselytes is the only believer's baptism known to Scripture.*

Q. I cannot see that 1 Cor. vii. 14 gives you any help?

A. There is no distinction here between the children of believers and the children of unbelievers, on the ground of one of the parents being a believer. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife. Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy." It proves the church-membership of infants, for it assumes the principle that, when both parents are reputed believers, their children belong to the Church, as a matter of course. But if he had taught that no child—even of believers—could be a Church member, there could have been no difficulty in the Corinthian mind.

Q. But the word holy means that the children were legitimate?

A. The word occurs about 700 times in the Septuagint, Apocrypha, and New Testament, and never means "legitimate" in any instance whatever. It means "holy" in the sense of being in covenant with God. Baptists forget that the heathenism even of both parents never made their children illegitimate.

Q. Have you any additional evidence?

A. Christ himself asserts the Church-membership of infants—"Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for *of such* is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xix. 14.) If the kingdom of heaven means the state of glory, our argument is strengthened, for if they are fit to enter the Church above are they not fit to enter the Church below. If the kingdom means the Gospel Church, then he positively asserts their Church membership.

Q. But the passage means by "of such" those adults who resemble children?

A. No; for, then, it speaks nonsense. Imagine Christ giving as a reason for bringing children to him that men, humble and teachable as children, belong to his Church.

Q. But if Christ meant that the children belonged to the kingdom, why did he not baptize them?

A. Because Christian baptism was not yet instituted. The passage proves the Church membership of infants for the coming day of baptism.

Q. But we never hear of the apostles baptizing infants?

A. They baptized households. They baptized the family of Lydia, though there is no evidence that any of her household but herself believed. If there were infants in the house, there was no occasion to mention them if they retained their old unchanged position in the covenant. Of the eleven distinct cases of baptism recorded in Scripture, three are family baptisms, proving that such were common in apostolic times. Is it credible that there was not a single infant in those three households? that every member of them was capable of faith, and actually believed at the very same time as their parents? Remember, too, that the apostles, in writing to the Churches, addressed themselves to children, who must, therefore, have been included in the membership. (Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii 10.) Again, *why do we never hear of the baptizing of households among the Baptists now?* If we never read in Scripture of the baptism of children, we never read of the conversion of children, and yet there must have been children converted as well as adults.

Q. But the historical argument is against you?

A. No such thing. It is for us. Tertullian was an opponent of infant baptism, for he held that baptism washes away sin; and that sin *after* baptism is specially dangerous; and that, therefore, young people should wait till they were married before they were baptized. He never calls it an innovation. Pelagius held that infants were born free of defilement. Then argued Augustine, "Why are infants baptized for the remission of sin, if they have no sin?" This implies that infant baptism was no innovation. For several centuries after Christ it was practised, and Tertullian was the

first known to object to it, on the grounds stated. He lived in the second century.

BAPTISM—ITS MODE.

Q. But I cannot recognise your sprinkling as baptism at all. Baptism means the immersion of the whole body in water. Every instance of baptism in the New Testament was by immersion?

A. We know—(Acts. ii. 41)—that 3000 were baptized at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. We ask, where was water to be found to dip such a multitude?—There is no river passing the city, and always a scarcity of water. How could the twelve apostles dip 3000 persons in four or five hours? It now exhausts a strong Baptist minister to dip twenty-four grown persons; but each apostle must have dipped 250 persons within a portion of a single day!

Q. But all Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptized by John in Jordan?

A. If he dipped them all, how could he do it during his short ministry of six months! Suppose there were 300,000 dipped—and this is a low estimate—he must have lived in the water more than half his time. He must have dipped about 1,648 persons every day! How did he do it?

Q. But the word “baptizo” (translated “baptize”) means always dip, and nothing but dip?

A. Suppose that *is* the literal meaning, carry out your principle fairly. At the Lord's Supper you consume a small quantity of bread and wine, yet supper literally means a full meal. If the literal observance of the word is not to regulate the observance of the Supper, why should it regulate our observance of baptism? If you ask, then, how much water is necessary to a scriptural baptism, I ask, how much bread and wine one must consume to partake of the Lord's Supper?

Q. But in the 175 classical instances, the word means dipping, and nothing else.

A. And in all instances known to us, the Greek word *deipnon* (supper) means a full meal, and nothing else. *Baptizo* has two meanings in Greek classics—to dip, and to put a liquid upon or over an object. The question is, which of

these two meanings does it retain in the Greek Testament? Now, at Pentecost, the disciples are said to have been baptized with the Holy Ghost, but were not dipped into Him. The Holy Spirit was poured out upon them. Christ says—"Ye shall receive power after the Holy Ghost is *come upon you.*" (Acts i. 8.) This "come upon" expresses mode. Again, "the cloven tongues sat upon each of them"—in fulfilment of the promise, "He shall baptize you with fire." (Matt. iii. 11.) Believers are nowhere said to be dipped or plunged into the Holy Spirit. (See also Acts ii. 3, 17, 18; xi. 15, 16.) The inward baptism is said to be given in the way of pouring. (Isa. iii. 14, 15; Heb. xii. 24; 1 Peter i. 2.) A man, then, is scripturally baptized when the baptizing element is poured upon him. We read of the washing of "tables and couches." The word used is *baptizo*. Were the tables and couches immersed? We read in Heb. ix. 10 of "divers baptisms," and we know that the greater part of these "divers baptisms" were accomplished by sprinkling or affusion. The word "sprinkle" is constantly occurring. (Compare Luke xi. 38 with Mark vii. 2-5, to show that washing is not dipping.) There is no command in the law of Moses enjoining immersion on priests or people. (See Numbers xix. 17, 18.)

Q. Did not John baptize in Jordan and at Ænon, "because there was much water there?"

A. But to baptize where there was much water (or, Greek, "many waters") is the exception in Scripture, and not the rule. The eunuch was baptized in a desert, the jailer in a prison, the 3,000 in a single day at Jerusalem, where there was not much water. The presumption lies quite on our side. But if John baptized at Jordan an Ænon, it was because no house could accommodate the multitude. He preached in the open air, and near the river side, where water, too, was required for the beasts of burden. Here is the argument, then: John might have chosen a place well provided with water, without dipping his hearers; therefore, the fact that he chose such a place can never prove that he dipped them.

Q. But it is said (Mark i. ix)—He was baptized of John in Jordan; or, literally, baptized in Jordan?

A. The preposition *into* (*eis*) is used sixty-five times with-

out the idea of motion. (Acts. xxv. 15.) In John ix. 7 it is "wash in (or rather *into*) the pool of Siloam." They were to go first into the water and then wash. We find again, in I Cor. x. 1, 2, that "they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea." This was not immersion. The Egyptians were immersed, not the Israelites. The reference in I Peter iii. 20, 21, is not to immersion, for Noah is said to be "saved by water." He was not plunged into the water, but kept above it by the ark.

Q. But Philip and the eunuch went down into the water and came up out of the water.

A. So does a horse every time he drinks at a river, but he is not dipped. They both stood in the water, and Philip poured the water on the eunuch's head. The baptism followed, and was consequent upon, their both going down into the water. It is a subsequent transaction and is mentioned as a separate article of information. The Greek words mean "to the water and *from* it." The same words occur in Matt. xvii. 27—"Go thou *to* the sea and cast a hook." Peter was not to plunge in.

Q. But believers are said to be buried by baptism. This implies immersion. (Rom. vi. 3, and Col. ii. 12.)

A. I answer—1. The external ordinance is not here referred to at all, nor is the mode. 2. Our being buried with Him is the *consequence* of baptism into Christ's death, that is of the inward baptism here referred to. But the passage says not a word as to the *manner* in which the baptism is applied, in order to produce these consequences. 3. It cannot refer to the external ordinance, for, if so, Simon Magus was "buried with Christ by baptism." 4. Besides, the figure proves nothing itself. The Eastern mode of burial was not putting the body into the earth, but placing it in a vault on a level with the ground. 5. Again, Christ was not drowned but crucified. The apostle says we are baptized into his death; but immersion is no representation of the actual death Christ died.

Q. You attach too much importance to the inconvenience of immersion?

A. Certainly not. Think of them. It would be dangerous to immerse sick people. Aged Baptist ministers have

no strength to dip heavy people. The immersion of females in public is hardly delicate. If you wish to follow the early mode, you ought to immerse them *naked*. This was the universal custom in primitive times.

Q. But immersion was the practice of the early Church?

A. It was in the age immediately succeeding the apostles, but many errors of doctrine and practice had crept in even then. But some of the most learned fathers quote—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you"—frequently in reference to Christian baptism, and affusion and sprinkling were also practised.

Q. We have changed Christ's formula of baptism—(Matt. xxviii. 19)—and baptize now simply in the name of Christ?

A. Yes, some of you. You base your practice on Acts xix. 5.—"They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." But why did Paul baptize at all? Was it not in obedience to Christ's command in that very passage of Matthew? If so why should we alter the formula prescribed in his very commission to preach and baptize so far as to omit the names of the Father and the Holy Ghost? The passage in Acts is in no way consistent with the commission. You might as well say that wine should not be used in the Lord's Supper, because *it* is called "a breaking of bread." (Acts ii. 42.)
